arXiv:1212.2688v1 [math.GR] 12 Dec 2012

RELATIONS BETWEEN VARIOUS BOUNDARIES OF RELATIVELY HYPERBOLIC GROUPS

HUNG TRAN

Abstract. Suppose a group G is relatively hyperbolic with respect to a collection $\mathbb{P}$ of its subgroups and also acts properly, cocompactly on a CAT(0) (or δ–hyperbolic) space X. The relatively hyperbolic structure provides a relative boundary $\partial(G,\mathbb{P})$. The CAT(0) structure provides a different boundary at infinity ∂X. In this article, we examine the connection between these two spaces at infinity. In particular, we show that $\partial(G,\mathbb{P})$ is G–equivariantly homeomorphic to the space obtained from ∂X by identifying the peripheral limit points of the same type.

1. Introduction

In [Gro87], Gromov introduced relatively hyperbolic groups. This concept was studied by Bowditch [Bow12], Osin [Osi06], Farb [Far98] and others. Many equivalent definitions for this concept were introduced. Gromov defined a relatively hyperbolic group by its action on a proper, hyperbolic space (cusped space) with some certain properties of the action (see the Definition 1 in [Bow12]). Bowditch (elaborating on an idea of Farb) viewed a relatively hyperbolic group by its action on a fine, hyperbolic graph (coned off space) with some certain properties (See Definition 4.2). By investigating the geometry of the cusped spaces and coned off spaces, he introduced two equivalent concepts of the relative boundary of a relatively hyperbolic group. In [Bow99], Bowditch also proved that the relative boundary of a relatively hyperbolic group is always locally connected if it is connected (under certain hypotheses on the peripheral subgroups).

Many CAT(0) or δ–hyperbolic spaces admit the proper, cocompact actions of relatively hyperbolic groups. These such spaces were studied by Hruska–Kleiner [HK05], Caprace [Cap09], Kapovich–Leeb [KL95], Hindawi [Hin05] and others. A natural question arises in the connection between the boundary of a CAT(0) space or a hyperbolic space with the relative boundary of a relatively hyperbolic group. Suppose a group G is relatively hyperbolic with respect to a collection $\mathbb{P}$ of its subgroups and also acts properly, cocompactly on a CAT(0) (or δ–hyperbolic) space X. What is the connection between the boundary of X and the relative boundary of G? The main theorem in this paper is the answer for this question:

Date: December 13, 2012.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F67, 20F65.

Main Theorem. *Let* $(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ *be a relatively hyperbolic group that acts properly and cocompactly on a* CAT(0) *space or a* δ*–hyperbolic space* X*. Then the relative boundary* $\partial(G, \mathbb{P})$ *of* G *is* G*–equivariantly homeomorphic to the space obtained from* ∂X *by identifying the peripheral limit points of the same type.*

For example, let G be the fundamental group of a complete 3–dimensional hyperbolic manifold of finite volume. The group G is obviously hyperbolic relative to the collection $\mathbb{P}$ of its cusp subgroups and G acts on the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^3$. Moreover, the action satisfies all conditions in the Definition 1 of [Bow12]. Thus the relative boundary of $(G, \mathbb{P})$ is obviously $\partial(G, \mathbb{P}) = \partial\mathbb{H}^3 = S^2$. Ruane [Rua05] considered a metric space X obtained from the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^3$ by deleting the family of disjoint open horoballs of the action and endowing X with the induced length metric. She proved that X is a complete CAT(0) space and boundary of X is the Sierpinski carpet. We obtain S^2 by identifying each circles inside the Sierpinski carpet and the circle of outside boundary of the Sierpinski carpet. Thus, we can see the connection between the relative boundary of the group G and the CAT(0) boundary of the space X.

From the theorem, we could see that we are able to understand the relative boundary of a relatively hyperbolic group if we have enough information of the boundary of the space on which the group acts properly, cocompactly and the peripheral limit points of each peripheral left coset. We take a look on some examples:

Let G be a δ–hyperbolic group and $\mathbb{P}$ be a finite collection of its quasiconvex, malnormal subgroups. Thus, G is not only a hyperbolic group but also a relatively hyperbolic with respect to the collection $\mathbb{P}$. By the main theorem, the relative boundary $\partial(G, \mathbb{P})$ is obtained from the boundary of G by identifying the limits points of each peripheral left coset.

In particular, if G is a fundamental group of a hyperbolic surface M and H is a fundamental group of a closed essential curve C of M, then the group G is not only a hyperbolic group but also a relatively hyperbolic with respect to H. We know that the boundary of G is a circle S^1 and each peripheral left coset gives us a pair of limit points. By identifying each such pair, we see that the relative boundary is a tree-graded over circles (for the definition of tree graded spaces, see [DS05]). This example was also discussed by Bowditch in [Bow01]. He examined these boundaries from a different point of view using the structure of the splitting as an amalgam.

In [HK05], Hruska and Kleiner proved that if a group G is relatively hyperbolic with respect to a collection of virtually abelian subgroups of rank at least two and G acts properly and cocompactly on a CAT(0) space X, then X has a family of isolated flats. Moreover, the set of all peripheral limit points is also the set of all points that lie in the boundaries of these flats. Two peripheral points have the same type iff they lie in the boundary of the same isolated flat. We know that each boundary of an isolated flat is an isolated sphere in the boundary of X. Thus, by identifying each such isolated sphere from the boundary of X we obtained the relative boundary of G.

Generally, many relatively hyperbolic groups are also "CAT(0) groups" in the sense that they act properly and cocompactly on CAT(0) spaces. For instances, the fundamental groups of compact, irreducible 3-manifolds with at least one hyperbolic JSJ component [KL95], CAT(0) groups with isolated flats [HK05], relatively hyperbolic Coxeter groups [Cap09], and fundamental groups of certain real analytic, nonpositively curved 4-manifolds [Hin05] and others. The main theorem could be applied to these such groups in order to understand the connection between the two different kinds of boundaries at infinity of them.

Another advantage of the theorem is that it helps us to see the connection between the boundaries of the cusped space Y, the coned off space K and the space X the group acts properly, cocompactly on (In particular, X carries the intrinsic geometry of the group). In [Bow12], Bowditch showed the connection between the cusped space Y and the coned off space K as the following:

$$\partial Y \simeq \Delta_\infty K$$

where $\Delta_\infty K$ is a topological space that contains ∂K, we will define $\Delta_\infty K$ later. In particular, there is a natural embedding of ∂K into ∂Y. Bowditch used the ∂Y or $\Delta_\infty K$ to define the relative boundary of a relatively hyperbolic group G. The main theorem deduces that there is a quotient map from ∂X to the ∂Y. As a consequence, there is an embedding from ∂K into ∂X. Therefore, we have the complete connection among the boundaries of three such kinds of spaces.

In this paper, we only focus on the case of CAT(0) spaces. The proof for the case of δ–hyperbolic spaces is nearly identical and we leave it to the reader.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank my advisor Prof. Christopher Hruska for very helpful comments and suggestions.

2. Some properties of δ–hyperbolic spaces and CAT(0) spaces

In this section, we review the concept of CAT(0) spaces and δ–hyperbolic spaces and their well-known properties we need to prove the main theorem. Most of information in this section are cited from [Bal95] and [GdlH90].

Definition 2.1. We say that a geodesic triangle Δ in a geodesic space X satisfies *the* CAT(0) *inequality* if $d(x, y) \leq d(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ for all points x, y on the edges of Δ and the corresponding points $\overline{x}, \overline{y}$ on the edges of the comparison triangle $\overline{\Delta}$ in Euclidean space $\mathbb{E}^2$.

Definition 2.2. A geodesic space X is said to be *CAT(0) space* if every triangle in X satisfies the CAT(0) inequality.

If X is a CAT(0) space, then *the CAT(0) boundary* of X, denoted ∂X, is defined to be the set of all equivalence classes of geodesic rays in X, where two rays c, c' are equivalent if the Hausdorff distance between them is finite.

On ∂X, we could build a topology as the following :

We note that for any $x \in X$ and $\xi \in \partial X$ there is a unique geodesic ray $\alpha_{x,\xi} \colon [0, \infty) \to X$ with $\alpha_{x,\xi}(0) = x$ and $[\alpha_{x,\xi}] = \xi$. We have a topology on ∂X by using the sets $U(x, \xi, R, \epsilon) = \{\, \xi' \in \partial X \mid d\bigl(\alpha_{x,\xi}(R), \alpha_{x,\xi'}(R)\bigr) \leq \epsilon \,\}$, where $x \in X, \xi \in \partial X, R > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ as a basis.

Definition 2.3. A geodesic metric space (X, d) is *δ–hyperbolic* if every geodesic triangle with vertices in X is *δ–thin* in the sense that each side lies in the δ–neighborhood of the union of others sides. If X is a δ–hyperbolic space, then we could build *the hyperbolic boundary* of X, denoted ∂X, by the same way we do in a CAT(0) space. That is, the hyperbolic boundary of X is defined to be the set of all equivalence classes of geodesic rays in X, where two rays c, c' are equivalent if the Hausdorff distance between them is finite. However, the topology on it is slightly different from the topology on the boundary of a CAT(0) space.

Remark 2.4. For each finite path α in a space X, we denote the endpoints of α by α_+ and α_-. For each ray α in a space X, we denote the initial point of α by α_+.

Definition 2.5. Let (X, d) be a metric space.

1. A path p in X is said to be *(L, C)–quasigeodesic* for some $L \geq 1, C \geq 0$, if for every subpath q of p the inequality $\ell(q) \leq L d(q_+, q_-) + C$ holds.
2. A path p in X is said to be *quasigeodesic* if it is (L, C)–quasigeodesic for some $L \geq 1, C \geq 0$.
3. A path p in X is said to be *L–quasigeodesic* if it is (L, L)–quasigeodesic for some $L \geq 1$.
4. Two quasigeodeics are *equivalent* if the Hausdorff distance between them is finite.

Definition 2.6. Let X and Y be two metric spaces.

1. The function Φ from X to Y is said to be a *K–quasi-isometry* for some constant $K \geq 1$ if for all $x, x' \in X$ the inequality
$$\frac{1}{K} d_X(x, x') - 1 \leq d_Y\bigl(\Phi(x), \Phi(x')\bigr) \leq K d_X(x, x') + K$$
holds and $N_K\bigl(\Phi(X)\bigr) = Y$.
2. The function Φ from X to Y is said to be a *quasi-isometry* if it is a K–quasi-isometry for some $K \geq 1$.

Here are some well-known properties of δ–hyperbolic spaces and CAT(0) spaces.

Lemma 2.7. *Let α and β be two geodesics in a* CAT(0) *space X such that the endpoints of β lie in $N_\epsilon(\alpha)$ for some positive number ϵ. Then $\beta \subset N_\epsilon(\alpha)$.*

Remark 2.8. For the case of δ–hyperbolic spaces, we have the similar result:

For each $\epsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$ there is $A = A(\epsilon, \delta) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let α and β be two geodesics in a δ–hyperbolic space X such that the endpoints of β lie in $N_\epsilon(\alpha)$. Then $\beta \subset N_A(\alpha)$.

Lemma 2.9. *For each choice of positive constants δ and σ, there is a positive number $R = R(\delta, \sigma)$ such that the following holds. Let α and α' be two equivalent geodesic rays in a δ–hyperbolic space such that $d(\alpha_+, \alpha'_+) \leq \sigma$ or α and α' be two geodesic segments such that $d(\alpha_+, \alpha'_+) \leq \sigma$ and $d(\alpha_-, \alpha'_-) \leq \sigma$. Then the Hausdorff distance between them is at most R.*

Lemma 2.10. *Let X be a δ–hyperbolic space. There is a number $M = M(\delta)$ such that the following holds. Let α and α' be two equivalent geodesic rays in X with the same initial point z. Let x and y be two points in α and α' respectively such that $d(z, x) = d(z, y)$. Then $d(x, y) \leq M$.*

3. Some properties of fine graphs and hyperbolic graphs

In this section, we review some concepts related to graphs, hyperbolic and fine graphs, the construction of hyperbolic closure and infinite hyperbolic closure of a hyperbolic and fine graph. Most of information in this section are cited from [Bow12].

Definition 3.1. Let K be a graph with the vertex set $V(K)$ and the edge set $E(K)$. We write $V_0(K)$ and $V_\infty(K)$ respectively for the sets of vertices of finite and infinite degree. A *path* of length n connecting $x, y \in V$ is a sequence, $x_0 x_1 \cdots x_n$ of vertices, with $x_0 = x$ and $x_n = y$, and with each x_i equal to or adjacent to x_{i+1}. A *ray* $x_0 x_1 \cdots x_n \cdots$ is defined similarly. A path $x_0 x_1 \cdots x_n$ is an *arc* if the x_i are all distinct. A *cycle* is a closed path $x_0 = x_n$, and a *circuit* is a cycle with all vertices distinct. We regard two cycles as the same if their vertices are cyclically permuted. We frequently regard arcs and circuits as subgraphs of K. We put a *path metric*, d_K, on $V(K)$, where $d_K(x, y)$ is the length of the shortest path in K connecting x and y.

Lemma 3.2 (Proposition 2.1, [Bow12])**.** *Let K be a graph. The following are equivalent:*

1. *For each positive number n, each edge of K is contained in only finitely many circuits of length n.*
2. *For each positive number n and $x, y \in V(K)$, the set of arcs of length n connecting x to y is finite.*

Definition 3.3. We say that a graph is *fine* if it satisfies one, hence two, of the properties in Lemma 3.2.

From now, we assume that K is connected, fine and hyperbolic. Let ∂K be the usual hyperbolic boundary of K and we assume that ∂K has more than two points. We define $\Delta K = V(K) \cup \partial K$, we call *the hyperbolic closure* *of* K and $\Delta_\infty K = V_\infty(K) \cup \partial K$, we call *the infinite hyperbolic closure of* K. We put a topology on $\Delta(K)$ as follows:

For each $a \in \Delta K$ and A a finite set of $V(K)$ that does not contain a, we define $M(a, A)$ to be the set of points $b \in \Delta K$ such that there is at least one geodesic α from a to b that does not meet A. We define a set $U \subset \Delta K$ to be open if for all $a \in U$, there is a finite subset $A \subset V(K)$ that does not contain a such that $M(a, A) \subset U$.

We observe that the set V_0 of all finite degree vertices of K is also the set of all isolated points in ΔK. Thus, we could view $\Delta_\infty K$ as ΔK minus the set of all isolated points.

Definition 3.4. For each $\lambda \geq 1, c \geq 0$, $a \in \Delta K$ and a finite set A of $V(K)$ that does not contain a, we define $M_{(\lambda,c)}(a, A)$ to be the set of points $b \in \Delta K$ such that there is at least one (λ, c)–quasigeodesic α from a to b that does not meet A.

Lemma 3.5 (Bowditch, [Bow12])**.** *Let K be a fine and hyperbolic graph. Then:*

1. *For each $\lambda \geq 1, c \geq 0$, the collection of all sets of the form $M_{(\lambda,c)}(a, A)$, where $a \in \Delta K$ and A is a finite set of $V(K)$ that does not contain a, forms the basis for the topology on ΔK as defined above.*
2. *ΔK is hausdorff.*
3. *The subspace topology on ∂K induced from ΔK agrees with the usual topology on ∂K.*
4. *ΔK and $\Delta_\infty K$ are compact.*

4. Some properties of the Cayley graph and coned off Cayley graph of relatively hyperbolic group

The aim of this section is to show the concept of relatively hyperbolic groups, the concept of the relative boundary of a relatively hyperbolic group, some properties of the Cayley graph, the coned off Cayley graph of a relatively hyperbolic group and the connection between these two graphs.

Definition 4.1. Given a finitely generated group G with Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, S)$ equipped with the path metric and a collection $\mathbb{P}$ of subgroups of G, one can construct the *coned off Cayley graph* $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ as follows: For each left coset gP where $P \in \mathbb{P}$, add a vertex v_{gP}, we call *peripheral vertex*, to the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, S)$ and for each element x of gP, add an edge $e(x, gP)$, we call *peripheral half edge*, of length $1/2$ from x to the vertex v_{gP}. This results in a metric space that may not be proper (i.e. closed balls need not be compact).

Definition 4.2 (Relatively hyperbolic group)**.** A finitely generated group G is said to be *hyperbolic relative to a collection $\mathbb{P}$ of subgroups of G* if the coned off Cayley graph has the following properties:

1. It is δ–hyperbolic and

(2) It is fine.

Each group $P \in \mathbb{P}$ is said to be a *peripheral subgroup* and its left cosets are said to be *peripheral left cosets* and we denote the collection of all peripheral left cosets by Π.

Definition 4.3 (Relative boundary)**.** Suppose $(G, \mathbb{P})$ is relatively hyperbolic, and S is a finite generating set for G. The *relative boundary* $\partial(G, \mathbb{P})$ is the space $\Delta_\infty\big(\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})\big)$.

Remark 4.4. Bowditch has shown that the relative boundary does not depend on the choice of finite generating set. Indeed, if S and T are finite generating sets for G then the spaces $\Delta_\infty\big(\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})\big)$ and $\Delta_\infty\big(\hat{\Gamma}(G, T, \mathbb{P})\big)$ are G–equivariantly homeomorphic (see [Bow12])

Remark 4.5. In $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$, we call an edge labelled by an element in the set S of generators a *S–edge* and we call an edge that consists of two peripheral half edges with some peripheral vertex v_{gP} in the middle a *peripheral edge.*

From now, we assume that group G is a non-elementary hyperbolic relative to some collection $\mathbb{P}$ of its subgroups and we denote the metric in the $\Gamma(G, S)$ by d_S and the metric in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ by d.

Lemma 4.6 (Osin, [Osi06])**.** *If G is a finitely generated group which is hyperbolic relative to the collection $\mathbb{P}$ of subgroups of G, then $\mathbb{P}$ is finite.*

Definition 4.7. Let (X, d) be a geodesic metric space. Let $\big(Y(p)\big)_{p\in P}$ be a collection of subsets of X, indexed by a set P. We say that:

(1) $\big(Y(p)\big)_{p\in P}$ is *quasidense* if $X = N_t\big(\bigcup_{p\in P} Y(p)\big)$ for some $t \geq 0$.

(2) $\big(Y(p)\big)_{p\in P}$ is *locally finite* if $\{\, p \in P \mid d\big(x, Y(p)\big) \leq u \,\}$ is finite for all $x \in X$ and $u \geq 0$.

(3) $\big(Y(p)\big)_{p\in P}$ has *the bounded penetration property* if, given any $r \geq 0$, there is some $D = D(r) \geq 0$ such that for all distinct $p, q \in P$, the set $N_r\big(Y(p)\big) \cap N_r\big(Y(q)\big)$ has diameter at most D.

(4) $\big(Y(p)\big)_{p\in P}$ has *the uniform neighborhood quasiconvexity property* if, given any $\lambda \geq 1, C \geq 0, r \geq 0$, there is some $D = D(\lambda, C, r) \geq 0$ such that any (λ, C)–quasigeodesic segment whose endpoints lie in the r–neighborhood of any set $Y(p)$ must lie in the D–neighborhood of $Y(p)$.

The proof for the following lemma is obvious and we leave it to the reader.

Lemma 4.8. *The properties in Definition 4.7 are invariant under quasi-isometry.*

Lemma 4.9 (Druţu–Sapir, [DS05])**.** *Let G be finitely generated and hyperbolic relative to a collection $\mathbb{P}$ of subgroups of G. Then in $\Gamma(G, S)$, the collection of peripheral left cosets $\{\, gP \mid P \in \mathbb{P}, g \in G \,\}$ has the properties in Definition 4.7.*

Definition 4.10. If $\hat{c}$ is a path in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ and $M \geq 0$, the *M–saturation* of $\hat{c}$, denoted $\mathrm{Sat}_M(\hat{c})$, is the union of all peripheral left cosets gP such that there is at least one G–vertex of $\hat{c}$ which lies in the M–neighborhood of gP with respect to d_S.

Lemma 4.11 (Theorem 3.26, [Osi06])**.** *There is a positive constant a such that the following holds. Let $\Delta = (p, q, r)$ be a geodesic triangle in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$. Then for each G–vertex v on p, there is a G–vertex u in the union $q \cup r$ such that $d_S(u, v) \leq a$.*

Lemma 4.12. *Let π and π' be two equivalent geodesic rays in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ (i.e the Hausdorff distance between π and π' is finite with respect to d) with the same initial point h_0. Suppose that (g_n) and (g'_n) are the sequences of all G–vertices of π and π' respectively. Then the Hausdorff distance between (g_n) and (g'_n) is finite with respect to the metric d_S.*

Proof. Let $M = M(\delta)$ be the number in Lemma 2.10, where δ is the hyperbolic constant of $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$. Let a be the number in Lemma 4.11.

For each $g_n \in \pi$, choose a positive integer $m > n + M(\delta) + a$. Let π'' be a geodesic in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ that connects g_m and g'_m. By Lemma 4.11, there is a G–vertex u in the union $\pi' \cup \pi''$ such that $d_S(u, g_n) \leq a$.

If $u \in \pi''$, then $d(g_n, g_m) \leq d(g_n, u) + d(u, g_m) \leq d_S(g_n, u) + d(u, g_m) \leq a + M(\delta)$. Also, $d(g_n, g_m) = m - n$. Thus, $m - n \leq a + M(\delta)$. This is a contradiction. It implies that $u \in \pi'$. Thus (g_n) lies in the a–neighborhood of (g'_n) with respect to the metric d_S.

Similarly, (g'_n) lies in the a–neighborhood of (g_n) with respect to the metric d_S. Therefore, the Hausdorff distance between (g_n) and (g'_n) is finite with respect to the metric d_S. □

Lemma 4.13 (Lemma 8.8, [Hru10])**.** *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there is $A = A(\epsilon) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let c be an ϵ–quasigeodesic in $\Gamma(G, S)$ and $\hat{c}$ be a geodesic in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ with the same endpoints in G. Then each G–vertex of $\hat{c}$ lies in the A–neighborhood of some vertex of c with respect to the metric d_S.*

Definition 4.14. Let c be a quasigeodesic in a space X. If c_0 is any subset of c, the *Hull* of c_0 in c, denoted $\mathrm{Hull}_c(c_0)$ is the smallest connected subspace of c containing c_0.

Lemma 4.15. *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there are constants $A = A(\epsilon) > 0$ and $B = B(\epsilon) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let c be an ϵ–quasigeodesic ray in $\Gamma(G, S)$ such that c is not contained in $N_R(gP)$ for any peripheral left coset gP and any positive number R. Then there is a geodesic ray $\hat{c}$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\hat{c}$ and c have the same initial point, each G–vertex of $\hat{c}$ lies in the A–neighborhood of c and c lies in the B–neighborhood of the* $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$ *with respect to the metric d_S.*

Proof. Let $A = A(\epsilon)$ be the number in Lemma 4.13. Since $(gP)_{gP \in \Pi}$ is an uniform neighborhood quasiconvex collection of subset of $\Gamma(G, S)$, then there is some $A_1 = A_1(A, \epsilon) \geq 0$ such that any ϵ–quasigeodesic segment whose endpoints lie in the A–neighborhood of any set gP must lie in the A_1–neighborhood of gP.

Choose (z_n) in c such that z_0 is the initial endpoint of c and $d_S(z_0, z_n) \to \infty$. For each n, choose a geodesic $\hat{c}_n$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ with the endpoints z_0 and z_n.

For each $m \geq 0$ and $n > m$, each G–vertex of $\hat{c}_n$ lies in the A–neighborhood of some vertex of $[z_0, z_n]$. For each G–vertex v of $\hat{c}_n$, let

$$c_v = \operatorname{Hull}_{[z_0,z_n]}\big([z_0, z_n] \cap B(v, A)\big)$$

For each edge e of $\hat{c}_n$ with G–endpoints v and w, let

$$c_e = \operatorname{Hull}_{[z_0,z_n]}(c_v \cup c_w)$$

We note that e is either a S–edge in $\Gamma(G, S)$ or e is a peripheral edge that consists of two peripheral half edges with some v_{gP} in the middle. We see that $[z_0, z_n]$ is covered by the sets c_e for all edge e of $\hat{c}_n$. Thus, $z_m \in c_e$ for some edge e of $\hat{c}_n$.

If e is a S–edge, the length c_e is at most $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon$. It implies that z_m lies within a distance $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon$ of $[z_0, z_n] \cap B(v, A)$, where v is a G–vertex incident to e. Thus, z_m lies within $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A$ of v. We choose $v_{m,n} = v$ and we have $d_S(v_{m,n}, z_m) \leq \epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A$.

If e is a peripheral edge, then the midpoint of e is v_{gP} for some peripheral left coset gP and $[z_0, z_n] \cap B(v, A)$ lies in the A–neighborhood of gP for each G–endpoint v of e. Since each point in c_e lies between two such points, c_e lies in the A_1–neighborhood of gP. In particular, $d_S(z_m, gP) \leq A_1$. We choose $v_{m,n} = v_{gP}$.

In both cases, we see that there are only finitely many possibilities for $v_{m,n}$ when we fix m and let $n > m$ arbitrary. By a diagonal sequence argument, we can suppose that $v_{m,n} = v_m$ is independent of $n > m$. In other words, $v_m \in \hat{c}_n$ for all $n > m$.

For each $0 \leq m < n$ there is a geodesic $d_{m,n}$ from z_0 to v_m such that $d_{m,n} \subset \hat{c}_n$. Since $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ is fine, then there are only finite many possibilities for $d_{m,n}$ when we fix m and let $n > m$ arbitrary. By a diagonal sequence argument again, we can suppose that $d_{m,n} = d_m$ is independent of $n > m$. In other words, $d_m \subset \hat{c}_n$ for all $n > m$.

We claim that the set $\{\, v_m \mid m \geq 0 \,\}$ is infinite. Suppose that $\{\, v_m \mid m \geq 0 \,\}$ is finite. For each $m \geq 0$, if v_m is a G–vertex, then we choose some peripheral left coset $g_m P_m$ containing v_m, otherwise we choose $g_m P_m = gP$ where $v_m = v_{gP}$. The chosen left cosets set $\{\, g_m P_m \mid m \geq 0 \,\}$ is also finite. Also,

$$d_S(z_m, g_m P_m) \leq \max\big\{\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A, A_1\big\}$$

Thus, we could find a subsequence (m_n) of the sequence (m) and $gP \in \{\, g_m P_m \mid m \geq 0 \,\}$ such that $g_{m_n} P_{m_n} = gP$. It implies that

$$d_S(z_{m_n}, gP) \leq \max\big\{\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A, A_1\big\}$$

It implies that $c \subset N_R(gP)$ for some R by the uniform neighborhood quasiconvexity of gP. This is a contradiction. Thus, $\{ v_m \mid m \geq 0 \}$ is infinite. Therefore, there is a geodesic ray $\hat{c}$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ emanating from z_0 and $d_m \subset \hat{c}$ for all m.

Each G–vertex u of $\hat{c}$ lies in some segment d_m and we know that $d_m \subset c_n$ when $n > m$, then u lies in the A–neighborhood of c. We claim that c lies in the B–neighborhood of the $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$ for some $B(\epsilon)$ with respect to metric d_S.

For each G–vertex v of $\hat{c}$, let

$$c_v = \mathrm{Hull}_c\big(c \cap B(v, A)\big)$$

For each edge e of $\hat{c}$ with G–endpoints v and w, let

$$c_e = \mathrm{Hull}_c(c_v \cup c_w)$$

We note that e is either a S–edge in $\Gamma(G, S)$ or e is a peripheral edge that consists of two peripheral half edges with some v_{gP} in the middle. Again, c is covered by the sets c_e for all edge e of $\hat{c}$. Thus, for each $x \in c$, $x \in c_e$ for some edge e of $\hat{c}$.

If e is a S–edge, the length c_e is at most $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon$. It implies that x lies within a distance $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon$ of $c \cap B(v, A)$, where v is a G–vertex incident to e. Thus, x lies within $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A$ of v. Therefore, x lies within $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A$ of $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$.

If e is a peripheral edge, then the midpoint of e is v_{gP} for some gP and $c \cap B(v, A)$ lies in the A–neighborhood of gP for each G–endpoint v of e. Since each point in c_e lies between two such points, c_e lies in the A_1–neighborhood of gP. In particular, $d_S(x, gP) \leq A_1$. Therefore, c lies in the B–neighborhood of the $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$ with respect to d_S for some $B(\epsilon)$. □

Lemma 4.16. *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there are constants $A = A(\epsilon) > 0$ and $B = B(\epsilon) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let c be an ϵ–quasigeodesic ray in $\Gamma(G, S)$ such that c is contained in $N_R(g^*P^*)$ for some peripheral left coset g^*P^* and some positive number R. Let $\hat{c}$ be a geodesic in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ that connects the initial point of c and $v_{g^*P^*}$. Then each G–vertex of $\hat{c}$ lies in the A–neighborhood of c and c lies in the B–neighborhood of* $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$ *with respect to the metric d_S. Moreover, if z^* is a point in c such that $d_S(z^*, g^*P^*) \leq A$, then the subray of c that emanates from z^* lies in the B–neighborhood of g^*P^* with respect to metric d_S.*

Proof. Let $A = A(\epsilon)$ be the number in Lemma 4.13. Since $(gP)_{gP \in \Pi}$ is an uniform neighborhood quasiconvex collection of subsets of $\Gamma(G, S)$, then there is some $A_1 = A_1(A, \epsilon) \geq 0$ such that any ϵ–quasigeodesic segment whose endpoints lie in the A–neighborhood of any set gP must lie in the A_1–neighborhood of gP. Choose (z_n) in c such that z_0 is the initial endpoint of c and $d_S(z_0, z_n) \to \infty$. For each n, choose a geodesic $\hat{c}_n$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ with the endpoints z_0 and z_n.

For each $m \geq 0$ and $n > m$, each G–vertex of $\hat{c}_n$ lies in the A–neighborhood of some vertex of $[z_0, z_n]$. For each G–vertex v of $\hat{c}_n$, let

$$c_v = \mathrm{Hull}_{[z_0,z_n]}\big([z_0, z_n] \cap B(v, A)\big)$$

For each edge e of $\hat{c}_n$ with G–endpoints v and w, let

$$c_e = \mathrm{Hull}_{[z_0,z_n]}(c_v \cup c_w)$$

We note that e is either a S–edge in $\Gamma(G, S)$ or e is a peripheral edge that consists of two peripheral half edges with some v_{gP} in the middle. We see that $[z_0, z_n]$ is covered by the sets c_e for all edge e of $\hat{c}_n$. Thus, $z_m \in c_e$ for some edge e of $\hat{c}_n$.

If e is a S–edge, the length c_e is at most $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon$. It implies that z_m lies within a distance $\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon$ of $[z_0, z_n] \cap B(v, A)$, where v is a vertex incident to e. Thus, z_m lies within $\epsilon(2A+1)+\epsilon+A$ of v. We choose $v_{m,n} = v$ and we have $d_S(v_{m,n}, z_m) \leq \epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A$.

If e is a peripheral edge, then the midpoint of e is v_{gP} for some peripheral left coset gP and $[z_0, z_n] \cap B(v, A)$ lies in the A–neighborhood of gP for each G–endpoint v of e. Since each point in c_e lies between two such points, c_e lies in the A_1–neighborhood of gP. In particular, $d_S(z_m, gP) \leq A_1$. We choose $v_{m,n} = v_{gP}$.

In both cases, we see that there are only finitely many possibilities for $v_{m,n}$ when we fix m and let $n > m$ arbitrary. By a diagonal sequence argument, we can suppose $v_{m,n} = v_m$ is independent of $n > m$. In other words, $v_m \in \hat{c}_n$ for all $n > m$.

Since c lies in the R–neighborhood of g^*P^*, then the length of each $\hat{c}_n$ is at most $2R+1$. It implies that the set $\{\, v_m \mid m \geq 0 \,\}$ is finite. For each $m \geq 0$, if v_m is a G–vertex, then we choose some $g_m P_m$ containing v_m, otherwise we choose $g_m P_m = gP$ where $v_m = v_{gP}$. Thus, the chosen peripheral left cosets set $\{\, g_m P_m \mid m \geq 0 \,\}$ is also finite. Also $d_S(z_m, g_m P_m) \leq A_2$, where $A_2 = \max\big\{\epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A, A_1\big\}$.

We could find a subsequence (m_n) of the sequence (m) and $g'P' \in \{\, g_m P_m \mid m \geq 0 \,\}$ such that $g_{m_n} P_{m_n} = g'P'$. It implies that $d_S(z_{m_n}, g'P') \leq A_2$. Since $g'P'$ is an uniform neighborhood quasiconvex set, then there is a number A_3 such that $N_{A_3}(g'P')$ contains an infinite subray of c. In particular, $\mathrm{diam}\big(N_{A_3}(g'P') \cap N_R(g^*P^*)\big)$ is infinite. It implies that $g'P' = g^*P^*$ by the bounded penetration property.

If $v_{g^*P^*}$ does not lie in any $\hat{c}_n$, then v_{m_n} must lie in $g_{m_n} P_{m_n} = g^*P^*$ and $d_S(z_{m_n}, v_{m_n}) \leq \epsilon(2A + 1) + \epsilon + A$ for all n. It is a contradiction since the geodesic $\hat{c}_k$ contain more than two points in g^*P^* for some k. Thus, $v_{g^*P^*}$ must lie in some $\hat{c}_n$.

We replace the geodesic segment of $\hat{c}_n$ that emanates from the initial point of c to the point $v_{g^*P^*}$ by $\hat{c}$, then the new path $\hat{c}'_n$ is also a geodesic with two endpoints in c. It implies that each G–vertex of $\hat{c}'_n$ lies in the A–neighborhood of c. In particular, each G–vertex of $\hat{c}$ lies in the A–neighborhood of c.

If z^* is a point in c such that $d(z^*, g^*P^*) < A$, then the subray of c that emanates from z^* lies in the A_3–neighborhood of g^*P^* for some A_3 since $d_S(z_{m_n}, g^*P^*) \leq A_2$ and g^*P^* is an uniform neighborhood quasiconvex set. Therefore, it is obvious that the subray of c that emanates from z^* lies in the B–neighborhood of g^*P^* and c lies in the B–neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$ for some $B(\epsilon)$ with respect to metric d_S. □

5. THE CONNECTION AMONG THE CAT(0) GEOMETRY, THE CAYLEY GRAPH AND THE CONED OFF CAYLEY GRAPH

In this section, we build the connection between the space that a relatively hyperbolic group acts on and the associated graphs of the group (Cayley graph and coned off Cayley graph). It is the key step to prove the Main Theorem in Section 6.

From now, we denote the metric in $\Gamma(G,S)$ by d_S, the metric in $\hat{\Gamma}(G,S,\mathbb{P})$ by d, and the metric in X by d_X. We suppose the finitely generated non-elementary relatively hyperbolic group G acts properly and cocompactly on the metric space X, where X is a CAT(0) space. Therefore, we have a G–equivariant map $\Phi\colon \Gamma(G,S) \to X$ that satisfies the inequality

$$\frac{1}{K} d_S(u,u') - 1 \leq d_X\big(\Phi(u), \Phi(u')\big) \leq K d_S(u,u') \tag{1}$$

for all $u, u' \in \Gamma(G,S)$ and $N_K\big(\Phi(X)\big) = Y$ for some $K \geq 1$. In particular, Φ is a K–quasi-isometry. We note the reader that we will use the inequality (1) many times in the rest of the paper.

Lemma 5.1. *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a positive number $L = L(\epsilon)$ such that if c is an ϵ–quasigeodesic in $\Gamma(G,S)$, then $\Phi(c)$ is a L–quasigeodesic in X.*

The proof of this lemma is elementary and we leave it to the reader.

We define $Y_{gP} = \Phi(gP)$ for each peripheral left coset gP and we call it a *peripheral space.*

For each peripheral space Y_{gP}, we define its boundary in X, denoted ∂Y_{gP}, to be the set of all $[\gamma] \in \partial X$ where $\gamma \subset N_R(Y_{gP})$ for some R. Each element in such ∂Y_{gP} is said to be a *peripheral limit point.*

We observe that ∂Y_{gP} is a non-empty set if P is infinite. Moreover, each Y_{gP} depends on the G–equivariant quasi-isometric map Φ but ∂Y_{gP} does not. We also observe that the group G acts on the CAT(0) boundary of X and the set of all peripheral limit points is invariant under the action of G.

Lemma 5.2. *$(Y_{gP})_{gP\in\Pi}$ is a quasidense, locally finite, bounded penetration and uniform neighborhood quasiconvex collection of subsets in X.*

Proof. It is obvious since $(gP)_{gP\in\Pi}$ is a quasidense, locally finite, bounded penetration and uniform neighborhood quasiconvex collection of subsets in $\Gamma(G,S), X$ and $\Gamma(G,S)$ are quasi-isometric under Φ and $(Y_{gP})_{gP\in\Pi}$ is the image of $(gP)_{gP\in\Pi}$ under the quasi-isometric map Φ. □

Lemma 5.3. *$\partial Y_{gP} \cap \partial Y_{g'P'} = \varnothing$ when $gP \neq g'P'$.*

Proof. It is obvious since $(Y_{gP})_{gP \in \Pi}$ has the bounded penetration property. □

From the result of Lemma 5.3, it makes sense to have the following definition:

Definition 5.4. Two peripheral limit points are said to be of *the same type* if they both lie in ∂Y_{gP} for some peripheral left coset gP.

Lemma 5.5. *If x and y are two peripheral limit points of the same type and g is any group element in G, then gx and gy are also two peripheral limit points of the same type.*

The proof for this lemma is obvious and we leave it to the reader.

Remark 5.6. From the result of Lemma 5.5, we see that the group G acts on the space obtained from ∂X by identifying all peripheral limit points of the same type.

Lemma 5.7. *There are constants $\epsilon > 0$, $r > 0$ such that the following holds. If α is a geodesic in X, then there is an ϵ–quasigeodesic c in $\Gamma(G, S)$ such that the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c)$ and α is at most r. Moreover, if α is a geodesic segment with two endpoints $\Phi(g)$ and $\Phi(h)$, where $g, h \in G$, then c could be chosen with endpoints g and h. If α is a geodesic ray with initial point $\Phi(g)$, where $g \in G$, then c could be chosen with initial points g.*

Proof. It is obvious since X and $\Gamma(G, S)$ are quasi-isometric under the map Φ. □

Definition 5.8. A pair of paths $(c, \hat{c})$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ is said to be an (ϵ, A)–*nice pair* if c is an ϵ–quasigeodesic ray in $\Gamma(G, S)$, $\hat{c}$ is a geodesic ray in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ and each G–vertex of $\hat{c}$ lies in the A–neighborhood of c with respect to metric d_S. A pair of paths $(c, \hat{c})$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ is said to be a *nice pair* if it is an (ϵ, A)–nice pair for some ϵ, A. A pair of paths $(c, \hat{c})$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ is said to be an (ϵ, A, r)*–nice pair of some geodesic α in X* if $(c, \hat{c})$ is an (ϵ, A)–nice pair and the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c)$ and α is at most r. A pair of paths $(c, \hat{c})$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ is said to be a *nice pair of some geodesic α in X* if $(c, \hat{c})$ is an (ϵ, A, r)–nice pair of α for some ϵ, A, r.

Remark 5.9. If $(c, \hat{c})$ is an nice pair in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$, the Hausdorff distance between them is finite with respect to metric d.

Lemma 5.10. *There are positive constants ϵ, A, r, B such that the following holds. Let α be a geodesic ray in space X such that $[\alpha] \notin \partial Y_{gP}$ for any gP. Then there is an (ϵ, A, r)–nice pair $(c, \hat{c})$ of α such that c lies in the B–neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$ with respect to d_S. Moreover, if α is a geodesic ray with initial point $\Phi(g)$, where $g \in G$, then c and $\hat{c}$ could be chosen with initial points g.*

Proof. The lemma can be proved by using the Lemma 5.7, Lemma 4.15, and the facts X and $\Gamma(G,S)$ are quasi-isometric under Φ and $\big(Y_{gP}\big)_{gP\in\Pi}$ is the image of $(gP)_{gP\in\Pi}$ under the quasi-isometric map Φ. $\square$

Lemma 5.11. *For each geodesic ray π in $\hat{\Gamma}(G,S,\mathbb{P})$ there is a geodesic ray γ in X such that $[\gamma]\notin\partial Y_{gP}$ for any peripheral left coset gP and the following holds. If $(c,\hat{c})$ is an arbitrary nice pair of γ, then the Hausdorff distance between π and $\hat{c}$ is finite in $\hat{\Gamma}(G,S,\mathbb{P})$ or π and $\hat{c}$ are equivalent geodesic rays in $\hat{\Gamma}(G,S,\mathbb{P})$.*

Proof. Let $\{g_n\}$ be the set of all G–vertices of π. For each $n\geq 1$ choose a geodesic γ_n connecting $\Phi(g_0)$ and $\Phi(g_n)$ in X. By Lemma 5.7, there is an ϵ–quasigeodesic c_n with the endpoints g_0 and g_n such that the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c_n)$ and γ_n is at most r for some uniform constants ϵ and r. There is a subsequence (γ_{m_n}) of (γ_n) that approaches to a geodesic γ in X.

For each $m\geq 0$ and $m_n>m$, there is a point z_{m_n} in c_{m_n} such that $d_S(z_{m_n},g_m)\leq A$ for some $A=A(\epsilon)$ defined in Lemma 4.13. By inequality (1), $d_X\big(\Phi(g_m),\Phi(z_{m_n})\big)\leq KA$. Since the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c_{m_n})$ and γ_{m_n} is at most r, then there is $w_{m_n}\in\gamma_{m_n}$ such that $d_X\big(\Phi(z_{m_n}),w_{m_n}\big)\leq r$. It implies that $d_X\big(\Phi(g_m),w_{m_n}\big)\leq KA+r$. We could assume that w_{m_n} approaches $w\in\gamma$. Thus, $\Phi(g_m)$ lies in the $(KA+r)$–neighborhood of γ.

For each $n\geq 1$, choose α_n be a geodesic that connect $\Phi(g_{n-1})$ and $\Phi(g_n)$ and we define $\alpha=\alpha_1\cup\alpha_2\cup\alpha_3\cdots$. Since the endpoints of each α_i lies in the $(KA+r)$–neighborhood of γ, then α also lies in the $(KA+r)$–neighborhood of γ by Lemma 2.7. Since $d_X\big(\Phi(g_0),\Phi(g_n)\big)$ approaches infinity, then α is an infinite ray. Thus γ lies in the M_1–neighborhood of α for some M_1.

If $\gamma\subset N_R(Y_{gP})$ for some positive number R and some peripheral left coset gP, then $\alpha\subset N_{R+KA+r}(Y_{gP})$. In particular, $\Phi(g_n)$ lies in the $N_{R+KA+r}(Y_{gP})$ for all n. It implies g_n lies in the $\big(K(R+KA+r)+K\big)$–neighborhood of gP for all n by the inequality (1). Thus $d(g_0,g_n)$ are bounded. This is a contradiction since π is a geodesic. Thus, $[\gamma]\notin\partial Y_{gP}$ for any peripheral left coset gP.

Let $(c,\hat{c})$ be any nice pairs of γ. Thus, the Hausdorff distance between γ and $\Phi(c)$ is at most $r'<\infty$ and G–vertices of $\hat{c}$ lie in some the A'–neighborhood of c with respect to d_S. (The existence of $(c,\hat{c})$ is guaranteed by Lemma 5.10.)

For each u in $\hat{c}$ there is v in c such that $d_S(u,v)\leq A'$. Since the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c)$ and γ is at most r', then there is z in γ such that $d_X\big(\Phi(v),z\big)\leq r'$. Since γ lies in the M_1–neighborhood of α, there is w in some $\alpha_n=\big[\Phi(g_{n-1}),\Phi(g_n)\big]$ such that $d_X(z,w)\leq M_1$. Thus $d_X\big(\Phi(v),w\big)\leq M_1+r'$.

If g_{n-1} and g_n lie in some peripheral left coset gP, then $\Phi(g_{n-1})$ and $\Phi(g_n)$ lie in Y_{gP}. It implies w lies in some M_2–neighborhood of Y_{gP} by the uniform neighborhood quasiconvexity of Y_{gP}. Thus, there is g' in gP such that $d_X\big(w, \Phi(g')\big) \leq M_2$, then $d_X\big(\Phi(v), \Phi(g')\big) \leq M_1 + r' + M_2$. Thus, $d_S(v, g') \leq K(M_1 + r' + M_2) + K$ by the inequality (1). It implies that

$$d_S(u, g') \leq d_S(v, g') + d_S(u, v) \leq K(M_1 + r' + M_2) + K + A'$$

Also g_n and g' lie in the same peripheral left coset gP then $d(g_n, g') \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$d(g_n, u) \leq d(u, g') + d(g_n, g') \leq d_S(u, g') + d(g_n, g') \leq K(M_1 + r' + M_2) + K + A' + 1$$

If there is no peripheral left coset that contains both g_{n-1} and g_n, then g_{n-1} and g_n are two vertices of a S–edge of π. Since $d_S(g_{n-1}, g_n) = 1$, then $d_X\big(\Phi(g_{n-1}), \Phi(g_n)\big) \leq K$. It implies $d_X\big(w, \Phi(g_n)\big) \leq K$. Thus,

$$d_X\big(\Phi(v), \Phi(g_n)\big) \leq d_X\big(w, \Phi(g_n)\big) + d_X\big(\Phi(v), w\big) \leq K + r' + M_1$$

It implies that $d_S(v, g_n) \leq K(K + r' + M_1) + K$ by the inequality (1). Thus,

$$d_S(u, g_n) \leq d_S(v, g_n) + d_S(v, u) \leq K(K + r' + M_1) + K + A'$$

It implies that

$$d(u, g_n) \leq K(K + r' + M_1) + K + A'$$

Therefore, $\hat{c}$ lies in a bounded neighborhood of π with respect to d. Since $\hat{c}$ is a geodesic ray, then π also lies in a bounded neighborhood of $\hat{c}$. Therefore, in both cases, the Hausdorff distance between π and $\hat{c}$ with respect to d is finite or π and $\hat{c}$ are equivalent geodesic rays in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$. □

Lemma 5.12. *Let α and α' be two geodesic rays in X with the same initial point $\Phi(h_0)$, where $h_0 \in G$. Let $(c, \hat{c})$ and $(c', \hat{c}')$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ be (ϵ, A, r)–nice pairs of α and α' respectively. Suppose that the initial points of all $c, \hat{c}, c', \hat{c}'$ are h_0 and $\hat{c}$,$\hat{c}'$ are two equivalent geodesic rays in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$. Then α, α' are two equivalent geodesic rays in X.*

Proof. Let (g_n) and (g'_n) be the sequences of all G–vertices of $\hat{c}$ and $\hat{c}'$ respectively. Let (x_n) and (x'_n) be the sequences of vertices of c and c' respectively such that $d_S(g_n, x_n) \leq A$ and $d_S(g'_n, x'_n) \leq A$.

By Lemma 4.12, there is a constant v such that the Hausdorff distance between (g_n) and (g'_n) is at most v with respect to the metric d_S. It implies that the Hausdorff distance between (x_n) and (x'_n) is at most $v + 2A$ with respect to the metric d_S. Thus, the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(x_n)$ and $\Phi(x'_n)$ is at most $K(v + 2A)$ by the inequality (1).

Let (w_n) and (w'_n) be the sequences of vertices of α and α' respectively such that $d_X\big(w_n, \Phi(x_n)\big) \leq r$ and $d_X\big(w'_n, \Phi(x'_n)\big) \leq r$. It implies that the

Hausdorff distance between (w_n) and (w'_n) is at most $K(v+2A)+2r$. Also

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(\Phi(h_0), w_n\big) &\geq d_X\big(\Phi(h_0), \Phi(x_n)\big) - d_X\big(w_n, \Phi(x_n)\big) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{K} d_S(h_0, x_n) - 1 - r \\ &\geq \frac{1}{K}\big(d_S(h_0, g_n) - d_S(g_n, x_n)\big) - 1 - r \\ &\geq \frac{1}{K}\big(d(h_0, g_n) - A\big) - 1 - r \to \infty \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $d_X\big(\Phi(h'_0), w'_n\big) \to \infty$.

For each x in α, x must lie in $[w_{n-1}, w_n]$ for some n. Since w_{n-1}, w_n lie in the $\big(K(v+2A)+2r\big)$–neighborhood of α', then x also lies in the $\big(K(v+2A)+2r\big)$–neighborhood of α' by Lemma 2.7. Thus α lies in the $\big(K(v+2A)+2r\big)$–neighborhood of α'. Similarly, α' lies in the $\big(K(v+2A)+2r\big)$–neighborhood of α. Therefore, α, α' are two equivalent rays in X. □

Lemma 5.13. *Let α be a geodesic ray in X such that $[\alpha] \notin \partial Y_{gP}$ for any gP and $(c, \hat{c})$ be an (ϵ, A, r)–nice pair of α. Then, for each $g \in G$, $(gc, g\hat{c})$ is an (ϵ, A, r)–nice pair of $g\alpha$.*

Proof. It is obvious since G acts isometrically on X, $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$, $\Gamma(G, S)$ and the map Φ is G–equivariant. □

The proof for the following lemma is obvious and we leave it to the reader.

Lemma 5.14. *Let α be a geodesic ray in X such that $[\alpha] \in \partial Y_{gP}$ for some gP and h be any group element in G. Then $h[\alpha] \in \partial Y_{hgP}$.*

6. Main Theorem

In this section, we will show the connection between the CAT(0) boundary of X and the the relative boundary of a relatively hyperbolic group G that acts on X properly and cocompactly.

Now, we build the map $f\colon \partial X \to \Delta_\infty \hat{\Gamma}$ between the CAT(0) boundary of X and the infinite hyperbolic closure $\Delta_\infty \hat{\Gamma}$ of the $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ as the following:

Let $[\alpha]$ be a point in ∂X. If $[\alpha] \in \bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}$, then there is a unique peripheral left coset g_0P_0 such that $[\alpha] \in \partial Y_{g_0P_0}$. We define $f\big([\alpha]\big) = v_{g_0P_0}$. If $[\alpha] \notin \bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}$, then there is a nice pair $(c, \hat{c})$ in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ such that the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c)$ and α is finite. We define $f\big([\alpha]\big) = [\hat{c}]$.

Lemma 6.1. *f is well-defined*

Proof. Suppose $[\alpha_1]$= $[\alpha_2]$ in ∂X, where α_1 and α_2 are two geodesic rays in X. If one of them belongs to $\bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}$ then there is a unique peripheral left coset g_0P_0 such that $[\alpha_1] = [\alpha_2] \in \partial Y_{g_0P_0}$. Therefore, $f\big([\alpha_1]\big) = f\big([\alpha_2]\big) = v_{g_0P_0}$. Suppose that $[\alpha_1]$= $[\alpha_2]$ lies in $\partial X - \bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}$. Let $(c_1, \hat{c}_1)$ and $(c_2, \hat{c}_2)$ be two nice pairs of α_1 and α_2 respectively. Thus, the Hausdorff distances $d_H\big(\Phi(c_1), \alpha_1\big)$ and $d_H\big(\Phi(c_2), \alpha_2\big)$ are finite. It implies that the Hausdorff distance $d_H\big(\Phi(c_1), \Phi(c_2)\big) < \infty$. Thus the Hausdorff distance between c_1 and c_2 is finite with respect to metric d_S. It implies that the Hausdorff distance between c_1 and c_2 is also finite with respect to metric d. Since the Hausdorff distance between c_i and $\hat{c}_i$ is finite with respect to metric d for $i = 1, 2$, then the Hausdorff distance between $\hat{c}_1$ and $\hat{c}_2$ with respect to metric d is finite i.e $[\hat{c}_1] = [\hat{c}_2]$. $\square$

Lemma 6.2. $f(\partial X - \bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}) = \partial\hat{\Gamma}$.

Proof. It is guaranteed by the definition of f and Lemma 5.11. $\square$

Lemma 6.3. $f\big(\bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}\big) = V_\infty(\hat{\Gamma})$.

Proof. We have $f\big(\bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}\big) \subseteq V_\infty(\hat{\Gamma})$ by construction. For each $v_{gP} \in V_\infty(\hat{\Gamma})$, since P is infinite, we could choose $[\alpha] \in \partial Y_{gP}$ and we have $f\big([\alpha]\big) = v_{gP}$. Therefore, $f\big(\bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}\big) \supset V_\infty(\hat{\Gamma})$. $\square$

Lemma 6.4. *f is injective in $\partial X - \bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}$.*

Proof. It is guaranteed by Lemma 5.12. $\square$

Lemma 6.5. *f is G–equivariant.*

Proof. It is guaranteed by Lemma 5.13, Lemma 5.14 and the fact that $hv_{gP} = v_{hgP}$ for any peripheral vertex v_{gP} and any group element $h \in G$. $\square$

Lemma 6.6. *f is continuous at each non-peripheral limit point.*

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary point in $\partial X - \bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}$. Thus, $y = f(x) \in \partial\hat{\Gamma}$. Let W be a neighborhood of y in $\Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$. We will show that there is an neighborhood U of x such that $f(U) \subset W$. Since $\Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$ is a subspace of $\Delta\hat{\Gamma}$, then there is a finite set C of $V(\hat{\Gamma})$ such that $M(y, C) \cap \Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma} \subset W$.

Choose a geodesic ray α in X with the initial point $\Phi(h_0)$ for some h_0 in G such that $[\alpha]{=}x$. Let ϵ, r be the numbers in Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 5.7. Let A be the maximum of numbers A in Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 4.16. (We note that the number A in Lemma 4.16 depends on the number ϵ we have just chosen above.) Let $(c, \hat{c})$ be an (ϵ, A, r)–nice pair of α such that c and $\hat{c}$ have the same initial point h_0. We have $f(x) = f\big([\alpha]\big) = [\hat{c}]$.

Let $\sigma = \max\{\, d(h_0, a) \mid a \in C\,\}$. Let K be the constant in the inequality (1). Let $L = L(\epsilon)$ be number in Lemma 5.1. Let $M_1 = M_1(KA, L)$ be the constant such that any L–quasigeodesic segment whose endpoints lie in the KA–neighborhood of any set Y_{gP} must lie in the M_1–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. Let $R = R(\delta, \sigma)$ be the constant in Lemma 2.9, where δ is the hyperbolic constant of the $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$. Let $B = B(\epsilon)$ be the constant in Lemma 4.16. Let

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= K(M_1 + KA + 2r + 1) + K + 1 \\ n_2 &= K\big(2KA + 2r + KL(2A + 1) + L + 1\big) + K + 1 \\ n_3 &= K(KA + KB + 2r + 1) + K + 1 \\ n_0 &= 3\sigma + 2R + \max\{n_1, n_2, n_3\} + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Let h^* be a G–vertex in $\hat{c}$ such that $d(h_0,h^*)\geq n_0$. Choose y^* in c such that $d_S(y^*,h^*)\leq A$. It implies that $d_X\big(\Phi(y^*),\Phi(h^*)\big)\leq KA$. Choose a positive number S such that $d_X\big(\Phi(y^*),\alpha(S)\big)\leq r$. It implies that

$$d_X\big(\Phi(h^*),\alpha(S)\big)\leq d_X\big(\Phi(y^*),\Phi(h^*)\big)+d_X\big(\Phi(y^*),\alpha(S)\big)\leq KA+r$$

Let $U=U\big(\Phi(h_0),x,S,1\big)$ be a neighborhood of x (see Definition 2.2).

For each x' in U, there is a geodesic ray α' that emanates from $\Phi(h_0)$ such that $d_X\big(\alpha'(S),\alpha(S)\big)\leq 1$ and $[\alpha']=x'$. Let π be a geodesic in $\hat{\Gamma}$ connecting $f(x)$ and $f(x')$. We claim that $\pi\cap C=\varnothing$. We have two cases:

Case 1: Suppose x' lies in $\partial X-\bigcup_{gP\in\Pi}\partial Y_{gP}$

We let $(c',\hat{c}')$ be an (ϵ,A,r)–nice pair of α' such that c' and $\hat{c}'$ have the same initial point h_0. We have $f(x')=f\big([\alpha']\big)=[\hat{c}']$. Let (g_n) be the sequence of all G–vertices of $\hat{c}'$ and (x_n) be a sequence in c' such that $d_S(g_n,x_n)\leq A$. Certainly, $g_0=h_0$. We have $d_X\big(\alpha'(S),[\Phi(x_i),\Phi(x_{i+1})]\big)\leq r$ for some i. We try to show the distance between g_i and h^* in $\hat{\Gamma}(G,S,\mathbb{P})$ is bounded.

Suppose g_i,g_{i+1} both lie in some peripheral left coset gP. Since

$$d_X\big(\Phi(x_i),\Phi(g_i)\big)\leq Kd_S(x_i,g_i)\leq KA$$

and

$$d_X\big(\Phi(x_{i+1}),\Phi(g_{i+1})\big)\leq Kd_S(x_{i+1},g_{i+1})\leq KA$$

then $\big[\Phi(x_i),\Phi(x_{i+1})\big]$ lies in the M_1–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. It implies that

$$d_X\big(\alpha'(S),Y_{gP}\big)\leq M_1+r$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}d_X\big(Y_{gP},\Phi(h^*)\big)&\leq d_X\big(\alpha'(S),Y_{gP}\big)+d_X\big(\alpha'(S),\alpha(S)\big)+d_X\big(\Phi(h^*),\alpha(S)\big)\\&\leq M_1+r+1+KA+r\\&\leq M_1+2r+1+KA\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $d_S(gP,h^*)\leq K(M_1+2r+1+KA)+K$ by the inequality (1).

Also $g_i\in gP$, then

$$d(g_i,h^*)\leq K(M_1+2r+1+KA)+K+1\leq n_1$$

Suppose g_i,g_{i+1} are vertices of a S–edge. (i.e $d_S(g_i,g_{i+1})=1$). It implies that $d_X\big(\Phi(g_i),\Phi(g_{i+1})\big)\leq K$. Since

$$d_X\big(\Phi(x_i),\Phi(g_i)\big)\leq Kd_S(x_i,g_i)\leq KA$$

and

$$d_X\big(\Phi(x_{i+1}),\Phi(g_{i+1})\big)\leq Kd_S(x_{i+1},g_{i+1})\leq KA$$

then $d_X\big(\Phi(x_i),\Phi(x_{i+1})\big)\leq 2KA+K$. Since $\big[\Phi(x_i),\Phi(x_{i+1})\big]$ is a L–quasigeodesic, then its length of is at most $L(2KA+K)+L$.

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(\Phi(g_i),\alpha'(S)\big) &\leq d_X\big(\Phi(g_i),\Phi(x_i)\big)+d_X\big(\Phi(x_i),\alpha'(S)\big)\\ &\leq KA+\big(r+L(2KA+K)+L\big)\\ &\leq KA+r+KL(2A+1)+L \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(\Phi(g_i),\Phi(h^*)\big) &\leq d_X\big(\Phi(g_i),\alpha'(S)\big)+d_X\big(\alpha(S),\alpha'(S)\big)+d_X\big(\Phi(h^*),\alpha(S)\big)\\ &\leq KA+r+KL(2A+1)+L+1+KA+r\\ &\leq 2KA+2r+KL(2A+1)+L+1 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$d_S(g_i,h^*)\leq K\big(2KA+2r+KL(2A+1)+L+1\big)+K$$

Therefore,

$$d(g_i,h^*)\leq K\big(2KA+2r+KL(2A+1)+1+L\big)+K+1\leq n_2$$

Assume for the contradiction that $\pi\cap C\neq\varnothing$. Then we could choose z in π such that $d(h_0,z)=d(h_0,\pi)\leq\sigma$. Choose z_1,z_1' in $\hat{c}$ and $\hat{c}'$ respectively such that $d(z,z_1)=d(z,\hat{c})$ and $d(z,z_1')=d(z,\hat{c}')$. It implies that $d(z_1,z)\leq\sigma$ and $d(z_1',z)\leq\sigma$. Thus, $d(z_1,h_0)\leq 2\sigma$ and $d(z_1',h_0)\leq 2\sigma$. Choose z_2,z_2' in π such that $d(h^*,z_2)\leq R$ and $d(g_i,z_2')\leq R$. It implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d(h^*,g_i) &\geq d(z_2',z_2)-d(h^*,z_2)-d(z_2',g_i)\\ &\geq d(z,z_2')+d(z_2,z)-2R\\ &\geq \big(d(z_1',g_i)-d(z_1',z)-d(z_2',g_i)\big)+\big(d(z_1,h^*)-d(z,z_1)-d(h^*,z_2)\big)-2R\\ &\geq \big(d(z_1',g_i)-\sigma-R\big)+\big(d(z_1,h^*)-\sigma-R\big)-2R\\ &\geq \big(d(h_0,g_i)-d(h_0,z_1')\big)+\big(d(h_0,h^*)-d(h_0,z_1)\big)-2\sigma-4R\\ &\geq \big(d(h_0,h^*)-d(g_i,h^*)-2\sigma)\big)+\big(d(h_0,h^*)-2\sigma\big)-2\sigma-4R\\ &\geq 2n_0-6\sigma-4R-\max\{n_1,n_2\} \end{aligned}$$

Also $d(g_i,h^*)\leq\max\{n_1,n_2\}$. It implies that $n_0\leq 3\sigma+2R+\max\{n_1,n_2\}$. This is a contradiction for the choice of n_0. Thus, $\pi\cap C=\varnothing$ in this case.

Case 2: Suppose $x'\in\partial Y_{gP}$ for some peripheral left coset gP. Thus, α' lies in some R_1–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. Let $\hat{c}'$ be a geodesic from h_0 to v_{gP}. Choose c' to be an ϵ–quasigeodesic with the initial point h_0 in $\Gamma(G,S)$ such that the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c')$ and α' is at most r. Since α' lies in some R_1–neighborhood of Y_{gP}, then $\Phi(c')$ lies in the (R_1+r)–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. It implies that c' lies in the $\big(K(R_1+r)+K\big)$–neighborhood of gP by the inequality (1).

Let $(g_i)_{0\leq i\leq n}$ be the finite sequence of all G–vertices of $\hat{c}'$. By Lemma 4.16, $(g_i)_{0\leq i\leq n}$ lies in the A–neighborhood of c'. Let $(x_i)_{0\leq i\leq n}$ be a sequence in c' such that $d_S(g_i,x_i)\leq A$.

If $\alpha'(S)$ lies in the r–neighborhood of $\big[\Phi(x_i),\Phi(x_{i+1})\big]$ for some i, then we argue as the previous case.

Suppose $\alpha'(S)$ does not lie in the r–neighborhood of $\big[\Phi(x_i),\Phi(x_{i+1})\big]$ for any i. Since the subray c'' of c' that emanates from x_n must lie in the B–neighborhood of gP, then $\Phi(c'')$ lies in the KB–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. Thus, $\alpha'(S)$ lies in the $(KB+r)$–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. It leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
d_X\big(Y_{gP},\Phi(h^*)\big) &\le d_X\big(\alpha'(S),Y_{gP}\big)+d_X\big(\alpha'(S),\alpha(S)\big)+d_X\big(\Phi(h^*),\alpha(S)\big)\\
&\le KB+r+1+KA+r\\
&\le 2r+1+KA+KB
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$d_S(gP,h^*)\le K(2r+1+KA+KB)+K$$

Therefore,

$$d(v_{gP},h^*)\le K(2r+1+KA+KB)+K+1\le n_3$$

Assume for the contradiction that $\pi\cap C\neq\varnothing$. We argue the similar argument as the previous case to have $n_0\le 3\sigma+2R+n_3$. This is a contradiction for the choice of n_0. Thus, $\pi\cap C=\varnothing$ in this case.

In both cases, since there is a geodesic π connecting $y=f(x)$, $f(x')$ and $\pi\cap C=\varnothing$, then $f(x')\in M(y,C)\cap\Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$. It implies $f(U)\subset M(y,C)\cap\Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$. Thus $f(U)\subset W$. □

Lemma 6.7. *f is continuous at each peripheral limit point.*

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary peripheral limit point. Then x lies in $\partial Y_{g_0P_0}$ for some peripheral left coset g_0P_0. Thus, $y=f(x)=v_{g_0P_0}$. Let W be a neighborhood of y in $\Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$. We will show that there is an neighborhood U of x such that $f(U)\subset W$. Since $\Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$ is a subspace of $\Delta\hat{\Gamma}$, then there is a finite set C of vertices of $\hat{\Gamma}$ that does not contain $v_{g_0P_0}$ such that $M_{(1,1)}(v_{g_0P_0},C)\cap\Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}\subset W$.

Let C_1 be the set of all G–vertices of C and C_2 be the set of all peripheral vertices of C. Let $h_0\in g_0P_0-(C_1\cup\bigcup_{v_{gP}\in C_2}gP)$. Let $\sigma=\max\{\,d(h_0,a)\mid a\in C\,\}$. Choose a geodesic ray α in X with the initial point $\Phi(h_0)$ such that $[\alpha]$=x. We see that α lies in some R–neighborhood of $Y_{g_0P_0}$. Let ϵ,r be the numbers in Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 5.7. Let A be the maximum of numbers A in Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 4.16. Let B be the maximum of numbers B in Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 4.16 (We note that the numbers A and B in Lemma 4.16 depends on the number ϵ we have just chosen above). Let K be the constant in the inequality (1). Let $L=L(\epsilon)$ be number in Lemma 5.1. Let $m\ge\max\big\{K(KB+r+1+R)+K+1,\sigma\big\}+1$ be a positive integer. Let $M_1=M_1(r+1+R,L)$ be the constant such that any L–quasigeodesic segment whose endpoints lie in the $(r+1+R)$–neighborhood of any set Y_{gP} must lie in the M_1–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. Let M_2 be the supremum of all diameters of all sets $N_{KB}(Y_{gP})\cap N_{M_1}(Y_{g'P'})$ where gP and $g'P'$ are two different peripheral left cosets. Let ℓ be the number of peripheral subgroups.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_1 &= \max\{\, d_X\big(\Phi(h_0), c\big) \mid c \in \Phi(C_1)\,\}\\ \ell_2 &= \max\{\, d_X\big(\Phi(h_0), Y_{gP}\big) \mid v_{gP} \in C_2\,\}\\ \ell_3 &= \max\{\ell_2, KA + r\}\end{aligned}$$

Let $M = M(\ell_3)$ be the constant such that any geodesic segment whose endpoints lie in the ℓ_3–neighborhood of any set Y_{gP} must lie in the M–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. Choose $S_1 > \ell_1 + r + KA$ such that $\alpha(S_1) \notin N_{M+1}\big(\bigcup_{v_{gP}\in C_2} Y_{gP}\big)$. Let $S = S_1 + 2r + L\ell m(M_2+2)$. Let $U = U\big(\Phi(h_0), x, S, 1\big)$ be a neighborhood of x (see Definition 2.2).

For each x' in U, there is a geodesic ray α' that emanates from $\Phi(h_0)$ such that $d_X\big(\alpha'(S), \alpha(S)\big) \leq 1$ and $[\alpha'] = x'$. We will show that $f(x') \in M_{(1,1)}(v_{g_0P_0}, C) \cap \Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$. We have two cases.

Case 1: Suppose x' lies in $\partial X - \bigcup_{gP\in\Pi} \partial Y_{gP}$. We let $(c, \hat{c})$ be an (ϵ, A, r)–nice pair of α' such that c and $\hat{c}$ have the same initial point h_0. We have $f(x') = f\big([\alpha']\big) = [\hat{c}]$. We claim that $\hat{c} \cap C = \varnothing$.

Assume for the contradiction that $\hat{c} \cap C \neq \varnothing$, there is $a \in \hat{c} \cap C_1$ or $a \in \hat{c} \cap gP$ for some gP such that $v_{gP} \in C_2 \cap \hat{c}$. Let $v \in c$ such that $d_S(a, v) \leq A$. It implies that

$$d_X\big(\Phi(a), \Phi(v)\big) \leq K d_S(a, v) \leq KA$$

Let S' be a positive number such that $d_X\big(\alpha'(S'), \Phi(v)\big) \leq r$. It implies that

$$d_X\big(\Phi(a), \alpha'(S')\big) \leq KA + r$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}d_X\big(\Phi(a), \Phi(h_0)\big) &\geq d_X\big(\alpha'(S'), \Phi(h_0)\big) - d_X\big(\Phi(a), \alpha'(S')\big)\\ &\geq S' - r - KA\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $S' \leq S_1$. If $a \in C_1$, then $\Phi(a) \in \Phi(C_1)$. It implies that $d_X\big(\Phi(a), \Phi(h_0)\big) \leq \ell_1$. Thus $\ell_1 \geq S' - r - KA$ or $S' \leq \ell_1 + r + KA \leq S_1$. If $a \notin C_1$, then a lies in some gP such that $v_{gP} \in C_2$. Since

$$d_X\big(\Phi(a), \alpha'(S')\big) \leq KA + r \leq \ell_3$$

then $d_X\big(Y_{gP}, \alpha'(S')\big) \leq \ell_3$. Also, $d_X\big(Y_{gP}, \Phi(h_0)\big) \leq \ell_2 \leq \ell_3$. Thus, the subsegment $\big[\Phi(h_0), \alpha'(S')\big]$ of α' must lie in the M–neighborhood of Y_{gP}. Thus, the subsegment $\big[\Phi(h_0), \alpha'(S')\big]$ must lie in the M–neighborhood of $\bigcup_{v_{gP}\in C_2} Y_{gP}$. Also $d_X\big(\alpha(S_1), \alpha'(S_1)\big) \leq 1$. Thus, $S' \leq S_1$ by the choice of S_1.

Let $u \in c$ such that $d_X\big(\alpha'(S), \Phi(u)\big) \leq r$. Choose G–vertex $g^* \in \hat{c}$ such that $d_S(u, g^*P^*) \leq B$ for some g^*P^*. We could choose such g^* to maximize $d(h_0, g^*)$. It implies that

$$d_X\big(\Phi(u), Y_{g^*P^*}\big) \leq K d_S(u, g^*P^*) \leq KB$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(\Phi(u), Y_{g_0P_0}\big) &\leq d_X\big(\Phi(u), \alpha'(S)\big) + d_X\big(\alpha(S), \alpha'(S)\big) + d_X\big(\alpha(S), Y_{g_0P_0}\big) \\ &\leq r + 1 + R \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(Y_{g_0P_0}, Y_{g^*P^*}\big) &\leq d_X\big(\Phi(u), Y_{g^*P^*}\big) + d_X\big(\Phi(u), Y_{g_0P_0}\big) \\ &\leq KB + r + 1 + R \end{aligned}$$

It leads to

$$d_S(g_0P_0, g^*P^*) \leq K(KB + r + 1 + R) + K$$

Therefore,

$$d(h_0, g^*) \leq K(KB + r + 1 + R) + K + 1 \leq m$$

By using the similar technique as we used in Lemma 4.15 and Lemma 4.16, we could see that $[u, v]$ lies in the B–neighborhood of the 0–saturation of the segment $\hat{c}'$ of $\hat{c}$ that connects a and g^*. The length of this segment is less than m. Thus $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c}')$ is the union of at most ℓm peripheral left cosets. It implies that $\Phi\big(\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c}')\big)$ is the union of at most ℓm peripheral spaces. Also $\big[\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big] = \Phi\big[u, v]\big) \subset N_{KB}\big(\Phi(\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c}')\big)$. Thus, there is a peripheral space $Y_{\overline{g}\overline{P}}$ such that $N_{KB}(Y_{\overline{g}\overline{P}})$ contains two points x^* and y^* in $\big[\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big]$ such that the length of the subsegment of $\big[\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big]$ connecting x^* and y^* is at least $1/\ell m$ of the length of $\big[\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big]$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big) &\geq d_X\big(\alpha'(S'), \alpha'(S)\big) - d_X\big(\alpha'(S'), \Phi(v)\big) - d_X\big(\alpha'(S), \Phi(u)\big) \\ &\geq S - S' - 2r \\ &\geq S - S_1 - 2r \end{aligned}$$

then the length of $\big[\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big]$ is at least $S - S_1 - 2r$. Since the segment $\big[\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big]$ is a L–quasigeodesic, then

$$d_X(x^*, y^*) \geq \frac{1}{L\ell m}(S - S_1 - 2r) - 1 \geq M_2 + 1$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(\Phi(u), Y_{g_0P_0}\big) &\leq d_X\big(\Phi(u), \alpha'(S)\big) + d_X\big(\alpha(S), \alpha'(S)\big) + d_X\big(\alpha(S), Y_{g_0P_0}\big) \\ &\leq r + 1 + R \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d_X\big(\Phi(v), Y_{g_0P_0}\big) &\leq d_X\big(\Phi(v), \alpha'(S')\big) + d_X\big(\alpha(S'), \alpha'(S')\big) + d_X\big(\alpha(S'), Y_{g_0P_0}\big) \\ &\leq r + 1 + R \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\big[\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\big]$ lies in the M_1–neighborhood of $Y_{g_0P_0}$. In particular, x^* and y^* lie in the M_1–neighborhood of $Y_{g_0P_0}$. Thus,

$$\mathrm{diam}\big(N_{KB}(Y_{\overline{g}\overline{P}}) \cap N_{M_1}(Y_{g_0P_0})\big) \geq d(x^*, y^*) \geq M_2 + 1$$

This is a contradiction for the choice of M_2. Therefore, $\hat{c} \cap C = \varnothing$.

If we extend $\hat{c}$ by attaching the peripheral half edge connecting $v_{g_0P_0}$ and the initial point h_0 of $\hat{c}$, then we have a $(1,1)$–quasigeodesic connecting $y = f(x) = v_{g_0P_0}$ and $f(x')$ that does not meet C. It implies $f(x') \in M_{(1,1)}(v_{g_0P_0}, C) \cap \Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$.

Case 2: Suppose $x' \in \partial Y_{g'_0P'_0}$ for some $g'_0P'_0$. Let $\hat{c}$ be a geodesic in $\hat{\Gamma}(G, S, \mathbb{P})$ connecting h_0 to $v_{g'_0P'_0}$. Let c be an ϵ–quasigeodesic ray with the initial point h_0 in $\Gamma(G,S)$ such that the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi(c)$ and α' is at most r. Also α' lies in some R_1–neighborhood of $Y_{g'_0P'_0}$. Thus, $\Phi(c)$ lies in the $(R_1 + r)$–neighborhood of $Y_{g'_0P'_0}$. It implies that c lies in the $\big(K(R_1 + r) + K\big)$–neighborhood of $g'_0P'_0$. Therefore, c lies in the B–neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sat}_0(\hat{c})$. Choose $u \in c$ such that $d_X\big(\Phi(u), \alpha'(S)\big) \leq r$. There is G–vertex g^* in $\hat{c}$ such that $d_S(u, g^*P^*) \leq B$ for some g^*P^*. We argue as the previous case to have a $(1,1)$–quasigeodesic connecting $y = f(x) = v_{g_0P_0}$ and $f(x')$ that does not meet C. It implies $f(x') \in M_{(1,1)}(v_{g_0P_0}, C) \cap \Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$.

Since $f(x') \in M_{(1,1)}(v_{g_0P_0}, C) \cap \Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$ for all x' in U, then $f(U) \subset M(y, C) \cap \Delta_\infty\hat{\Gamma}$. Thus, $f(U) \subset W$. □

Lemma 6.8. *f is a quotient map.*

Proof. It is obvious since f is continuous, ∂X is a compact space and $\Delta_\infty(\hat{\Gamma})$ is Hausdorff. □

From all above lemmas in this section, the following lemma is obvious and completes the proof of the main theorem.

Lemma 6.9. *f induces a G–equivariant homeomorphism from the space obtained from ∂X by identifying the peripheral limit points of the same type to $\Delta_\infty(\hat{\Gamma})$.*

References

[Bal95] Werner Ballmann. *Lectures on spaces of nonpositive curvature*, volume 25 of *DMV Seminar*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995. With an appendix by Misha Brin.

[Bow99] B. H. Bowditch. Boundaries of geometrically finite groups. *Math. Z.*, 230(3):509–527, 1999.

[Bow01] B. H. Bowditch. Peripheral splittings of groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(10):4057–4082, 2001.

[Bow12] B. H. Bowditch. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 22(3):1250016, 66, 2012.

[Cap09] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace. Buildings with isolated subspaces and relatively hyperbolic Coxeter groups. *Innov. Incidence Geom.*, 10:15–31, 2009.

[DS05] Cornelia Druţu and Mark Sapir. Tree-graded spaces and asymptotic cones of groups. *Topology*, 44(5):959–1058, 2005. With an appendix by Denis Osin and Sapir.

[Far98] B. Farb. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 8(5):810–840, 1998.

[GdlH90] É. Ghys and P. de la Harpe, editors. *Sur les groupes hyperboliques d'après Mikhael Gromov*, volume 83 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston

Inc., Boston, MA, 1990. Papers from the Swiss Seminar on Hyperbolic Groups held in Bern, 1988.

[Gro87] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In *Essays in group theory*, volume 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.

[Hin05] Mohamad A. Hindawi. Large scale geometry of 4-dimensional closed nonpositively curved real analytic manifolds. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (30):1803–1815, 2005.

[HK05] G. Christopher Hruska and Bruce Kleiner. Hadamard spaces with isolated flats. *Geom. Topol.*, 9:1501–1538, 2005. With an appendix by the authors and Mohamad Hindawi.

[Hru10] G.C. Hruska. Relative hyperbolicity and relative quasiconvexity for countable groups. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 10(3):1807–1856, 2010.

[KL95] M. Kapovich and B. Leeb. On asymptotic cones and quasi-isometry classes of fundamental groups of 3-manifolds. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 5(3):582–603, 1995.

[Osi06] Denis V. Osin. Relatively hyperbolic groups: Intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 179(843):1–100, 2006.

[Rua05] Kim Ruane. CAT(0) boundaries of truncated hyperbolic space. *Topology Proc.*, 29(1):317–331, 2005. Spring Topology and Dynamical Systems Conference.

Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201, USA
E-mail address: `hctran@uwm.edu`